

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 IN THE MATTER OF INAPPROPRIATE
12 MISCELLANEOUS ACTION FILINGS
13 _____/

**ORDER RE: FILING OF
MISCELLANEOUS CASES**

14
15 Over the past several days, six actions have been filed in the San Francisco Division
16 of the United States District Court as “miscellaneous” actions even though they are not
17 properly categorized as such. See 07-80234, 07-80245, 07-80248, 07-80249, 07-80250, 07-
18 80251. All six actions are identical, except that the name of the plaintiff is different and the
19 defendant in each case is a different bank/mortgage lender. The pleadings filed are identical
20 except for the names: same font, same style, same demands. It is apparent that all filings
21 have been orchestrated by the same person or groups of persons. For example, each action
22 sues the defendant bank and “US Vessel DOES, ROES, and MOES 1-100 et al, US Vessel.”
23 Each plaintiff is identified as a “Sramineus Homo, US Vessel.” Each complaint makes an
24 approximately \$30 million demand on the defendant without alleging any basis for the
25 demand. And each complaint is titled: “Petition For Libel Of Review Of An Administrative
26 Judgment.”
27

28 Plaintiffs’ filing of these “petitions” as miscellaneous actions rather than civil actions

1 enables them to pay only a \$39 filing fee rather than the appropriate \$350 filing fee.
2 Accordingly, as these actions should not be filed as miscellaneous actions, the Clerk of the
3 United States District Court for the Northern District of California is directed to file any
4 future similar actions as civil actions requiring a \$350 filing fee. Any questions as to the
5 appropriate classification of a proposed complaint should be brought to the attention of the
6 General Duty Judge.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: October 31, 2007



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California